

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office
FLOOR DEBATE

April 8, 2002

LB 905

remarks that I made. The...I don't...frankly, I don't recall saying that this bill is going to be revenue neutral. In fact, this bill can't be revenue neutral. This bill, actually, will produce revenues in the second biennium. Now, it might be revenue neutral against the current estate tax system, but even that doesn't quite work out. This bill has to raise money, and if you look at the fiscal note you can see that it does. This bill has to raise money. And remember that we're doing this in response to the federal government's change, and it's another one of those changes where the federal government was going to erode Nebraska's tax base. What Senator Baker is really suggesting is that we continue to buy into that erosion of our tax base, and that we have what amounts to a \$2.1 million tax cut in the year '04-05, when we don't know if we can afford it. Now, Senator Baker, we didn't need the snack tax to balance the current biennium. But if you look at the status sheet that we handed out you can see that the subsequent biennium is not in good shape at all. What we have, in fact, is a very serious imbalance. It is in excess of a hundred million dollars. It's a hundred and...it...it...it is a serious imbalance. And as I think was pointed out during the debate on LB 1085, even that rather serious imbalance is considered by somebo...by some to be...no, it's more than that. That's the wrong one. It is in the category of wishful thinking because we have projected 7.2 percent growth in both years of the out biennium. Most people think we will not achieve 7.2 percent growth in the out biennium and, if we do not, the shortfall in year four will be even larger. Now, if we are to kind of go along with the federal government, we will have an opportunity to do that later. As I understand your amendment, the first adjustment would take place January 1 of 2004. That's quite a little ways away. In fact, we have a whole other session before us. And, in fact, we would have potentially two...two sessions of the Legislature before we would have to worry about that. That could, actually, be taken care of in the 2004 Session of the Legislature, if we chose to do that. And if we could afford to do a \$2.1 million tax cut at that time, we could go ahead and do it. Now, subsequent to that, of course, there are additional tax cuts that you're scheduling in 2006 and 2009. There's no way that we can tell whether or not we could afford those tax cuts then either. And we can't even tell, quite frankly, if the